

AIDS FOR TEACHERS SERIES

No. II

RADICALISM AND ITS RESULTS, 1760-1837

BY

R. J. WHITE

Fellow of Downing College, Cambridge



2s.

PUBLISHED BY THE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1965

This pamphlet first published 1965

Copyright by the Historical Association

*Printed in Great Britain by Cox & Wyman Ltd.,
London, Reading and Fakenham*

The publication of a pamphlet by the Historical Association does not necessarily imply the Association's official approbation of the opinions expressed therein

*The Historical Association General Series contains
several titles on related subjects*

*Suggestions from teachers for subjects which they would like to see
appear in this series should be sent to:*

*Dr. R. C. Smail,
Historical Association,
59a, Kennington Park Road,
London, S.E.11*

RADICALISM AND ITS RESULTS, 1760-1837

RADICALISM AND ITS RESULTS, 1760-1837

BY

R. J. WHITE

Fellow of Downing College, Cambridge

RADICALISM AND ITS RESULTS, 1760-1837

I.

RADICALISM with a large "R", unlike Conservatism with a large "C" and Liberalism with a large "L", is not a historical term of even proximate precision. There was never a Radical Party with a national organization, local associations, or a treasury. But there were, and there are, "Radicals", generally qualified with adjectives like "Philosophic", or "London", or "Westminster", or even (if we are to believe Disraeli) "Tory". In most respects the historian does better to talk or write of "the Radicals", or even of "a Radical", for although the breed may be a genus containing species, the individual is the proper subject to be studied. Radicalism is like Buffon's "Nature", a truly nominalist concept, scarcely susceptible at all of universal categories or classification. Sir Walter Scott took the name "Radical" to be a pseudonym for any fellow in a ragged coat or breeches, like "Sans-culotte". Charles Dickens, as a child born in 1812, knew that there were such things as Radicals, and imagined them to be "a terrible banditti", something to be prayed against. All he could make out about "Radical principles" were the tenets "that the Prince Regent wore stays: that nobody had any right to any salary: and that the army and navy ought to be put down". Harriet Martineau, looking back from 1849, recalled the terror inspired in the bosoms of young ladies by the Radicals of the Regency, those prodigious "radical forces that were always heard of but never seen", so that "even in the midst of towns, young ladies carried heavy planks and ironing-boards, to barricade windows in preparation for sieges from thousands of rebels whose footfall was long listened for throughout the darkness of the night . . ." Yet it was Miss Martineau who recorded for us the birth-date of "Radical" as a substantive instead of merely as an adjective of abuse in the vocabulary of politics. "It is stated to have been now," she reports of the year 1819, the year of Peterloo, "that the Reformers first assumed the name of Radicals." Samuel Bamford, the Radical weaver of Middleton in Lancashire, records that it was in this year also that "females voted with the

men at the Radical meetings". Evidently the name caught on from the moment the women took it up.

Although the last year of the life of George III (and the last year of the Regency) marks the point in time at which the name Radical as a substantive entered the vocabulary of politics, the adjectival term had been in common use along with the words "reform" or "reformers" for a generation and more. Thomas Hardy's London Corresponding Society had promulgated its "Plan of Radical Reform" in 1791, and this in its turn had been the programme of Major John Cartwright in his famous pamphlet, *Take Your Choice*, in 1776. Cartwright was fond of contrasting "radical" with "moderate" reform, greatly to the advantage of the radical variety. Radical reform accorded with his curious interpretation of English history, by which the ancient English constitution (presumably the brainchild of our democratic Anglo-Saxon forebears) had been a pure and simple structure of pristine beauty, something to "get back to" by cutting away the accretions of the centuries that had elapsed since the coming of "the crafty illegitimate of Normandy" and his robber-barons, those ancestors of the corrupt Whig oligarchy who had turned the Major into a radical in protest. This cutting back of weeds and encrustations gives us the proper and literal origin of the term "radical"—a return to origins or roots. The notion had been common enough in the revolutionary age of the Saints and the Levellers in the seventeenth century. To the Puritan, getting back to a purer (and by definition a more democratic) form of government may have been the political counterpart of a return to primitive Christianity. The strange notion that the further back one goes the purer and simpler things become was a favourite superstition in the Age of Reason, too. It is to be found not only in Rousseau with his Noble Savage, and in the obvious prepossessions of the Romantics with their "back-to-nature" cult. Even Montesquieu, the least credulous of men, said of English liberty and free government, "ce beau système a été trouvé dans les bois"—i.e. in the forests of the north where the Germans of Tacitus evolved their liberty-loving "moeurs".

Radical reformism, however, has rarely been the intellectual offspring of a simplicist interpretation of history. More often it has been the highly pertinent protest of "the injured and insulted" against what John Stuart Mill called (in accounting for *laissez-faire*) "the manifest selfishness and incompetence of

modern European governments". Laying the axe to the root of the tree of corruption was advocated not in order to save some imaginary tree of Saxon liberties, but in order to cut down the widespread electoral influence of such men as His Grace the Duke of Newcastle. When the first radical organization for parliamentary reform, the Society of the Supporters of the Bill of Rights, was founded early in 1769, it arose not from concern with the ideal purity of parliament but from public resentment at a quite explicit example of parliamentary tyranny. In announcing its foundation, the Society proclaimed its sole aim to be the maintenance of the legal and constitutional liberty of the subject. Its intention was to petition for the dissolution of the parliament which had unseated John Wilkes, the properly elected representative for the County of Middlesex, and co-opted the defeated candidate, Colonel Luttrell, in his place. Parliament had set the electorate at defiance, and thereby had violated the Constitution. It might have been argued that a House of Commons containing Colonel Luttrell was no House of Commons, that its acts were invalid, that its legislative enactments were no more binding upon the nation than "the oaths of so many drunken porters in Covent Garden" (as Sir Fletcher Norton once said of the House of Commons' resolutions). None of these things were said. The Bill of Rights Society simply declared that they meant "to support John Wilkes and his cause, as far as it is a public cause". It was not exclusively a public cause, for the Society was founded, at least in part, to pay John Wilkes' debts. But the body which had been founded to vindicate the rights of the electors of Middlesex in 1769, many of whose original members were men of business and substance in the City of London, was by the summer of 1771 rehearsing a number of truly radical practices of later years, including the pledging of parliamentary candidates to certain reformist principles drawn up in an Eleven-Point Programme, notably annual parliaments, the abolition of place-men and pensioners, and a full and equal representation of the people in the House of Commons. The "pledging" of candidates was to be a prominent and highly typical tactic of radical reform politics down to 1832. The practice implies a conception of the Member of Parliament and his functions the reverse of that adumbrated by Edmund Burke in his celebrated Speech to the Electors of Bristol at the Conclusion of the Poll in 1774. Radical politics was already producing the doctrine of

delegation rather than representation, of the mandatory rather than the senatorial concept of the House of Commons.

In 1776, John Wilkes rose in his place (which he had recovered in 1774) to ask leave to bring in a Bill "for a just and equal representation of the people of England in Parliament". Of course, the motion was rejected, but Wilkes' speech must always remain a landmark in the origins of Radicalism. What he said of the unfair and inadequate representation of the people, with his historical account of rotten boroughs resulting from the lapse of time and "abuses . . . contrary to the primary ideas of the English constitution . . . committed by our former princes", was already well-worn material, along with its conclusion that 254 members were returned by less than 6,000 persons, "generally the inhabitants of Cornish and other very insignificant boroughs". It was absurd to suppose that the sentiments of the people could be justly known from the resolutions of a Parliament composed as the present Parliament was. So far, he was saying little more than many a Whig before him had said—Chatham or Burke, or even John Locke. But when he went on to advocate extension of the suffrage he struck a note that had been muted, if not silent, in the Whig gamut. Every free agent, he said, should be represented in Parliament, and "*the rotten part of our constitution* should be lopped off". More deputies should be afforded to the rich and populous trading towns. "The disfranchising of the mean, venal, and dependent boroughs would be laying the axe to the root of corruption and treasury influence, as well as aristocratical tyranny." As for the mechanic, the poor peasant and the day-labourer, he had important rights in his family and his earnings, and should have some share in the power of making those laws which deeply interested them. The mass of the people are the original fountain of both the power and the revenue of the state.

Wilkes' final observations foreshadowed the "knife-and-fork" radicalism that was to emerge with the first working-class reform society, which appeared in the early days of 1791, when Thomas Hardy the shoemaker and a few artisan friends founded the London Corresponding Society. Hardy himself was determined, he says, "to form a society of another class of the people", and the subscription was a penny a week. Hitherto reform societies had been, like the Friends of the People, the Constitutional Society, and the Society for Constitutional Information, what Cobbett once called "under-strappers of the Whig oligarchy".

Now, the "people" who were to be befriended by gentlemen able to afford guinea subscriptions had their own organization, and the whole character of radical reformism took on a popular aspect. It was at this point that Government became alarmed. Pitt, himself a parliamentary reformer in the 1780s, now clamped down on the Radical societies and the reformist press. By the end of the century, the London Corresponding Society had gone underground, and Radicalism postponed its hopes, and most of its activities, for the duration—the duration of their country's war with Revolutionary France and Napoleon Bonaparte. It was at this time that Radicalism, not unnaturally, though for the most part unjustly, acquired a conspiratorial reputation. Henceforth, the word "Radical" was used most commonly as a smear for reformers in general, much as "Red" or "Bolshy" was used as a smear for Socialists in the nineteen twenties.

To equate Radicalism with Jacobinism, however, was not only libellous but unhistorical. The strength, particularly the moral and intellectual strength, of a radical political attitude in England owed nearly everything to middle-class Dissent. Large numbers of English people of the business and shop-keeping community were imbued with what Burke, speaking of the rebellious American Colonists, called "the dissidence of dissent and the protestantism of the Protestant religion". Largely by reason of the exclusionist legislation of an Anglican parliament in the later 17th century, they had become a kind of "Protestant underworld", a "second world" outside and beyond the pale of the Establishment, if not quite beyond the pale of the Constitution. They had nothing to lose by a remodelling of the institutions in which they had such an exiguous part. They were like the excluded middle-class of France, that natural breeding-ground of *Les Philosophes*, ripe for radical change, though not for revolution. They were respectable, moralistic, decently educated, at once politically conscious and frustrated, ideal material for the manufacture of Radicals. The most lively and intelligent of them were the Unitarians, people like Dr. Richard Price, whose Old Jewry sermon to the London Revolution Society (which took its name from 1688, not from 1789) drove Burke to launch his *Reflections on the Revolution in France, and on the Proceedings in Certain Societies in London relative to that Event . . .* These men had little to learn from the French Revolution, though they admired it in its early phases, imagining that the

French were about to catch up with the English. They were certainly not the stuff of which Marats and Robespierres are made.

What really rescued the English Radicals from their sorry plight during the French Revolution and the subsequent war was the arrival on the political scene of the people we call "The Philosophic Radicals". Their entry may be said to date from the year 1807, when "a few men of business and spirit" came together in the house of Francis Place, the breeches-maker of Charing Cross, who had been Chairman of the London Corresponding Society, in order to promote the election of Sir Francis Burdett for the Borough of Westminster. Place was the link between the London radicalism of the 1790s and that of the new century. Westminster had an electoral roll of 10,000 voters, mostly artisans and shopkeepers. Burdett was a Foxite Whig who had turned to Radicalism in despair of Whig reformism ever achieving anything but a re-allocation of "places". Like many a Whig of the days of Wilkes and the Bill of Rights Society, he had come to the conclusion that the Whig opposition to George III and his courtiers, and notably Edmund Burke and the Rockinghams, were selfish place-seekers concerned with little more than "to argue mankind into opposition for their peculiar interests alone", and that to consolidate the position of an aristocratic clique would not serve the interests of the people at large. The followers of Jeremy Bentham, with whom Burdett had now thrown in his lot, regarded Whig and Tory politics as a form of "shadow-boxing". They were engaged in a sham fight for the spoils of office, in which both sides pulled their punches. Hazlitt once called them two coaches rumbling along the same road to the same destination, and splashing each other with mud as they went. Burdett was a rich man, of aristocratic family. He loved the limelight. "England's Pride and Westminster's Glory" was his favourite title. But his election for Westminster as a Benthamite Radical in 1807 produced, from among his backers, "The Westminster Committee", which was to be the focus of London Radicalism in general for the next ten years and more.

Jeremy Bentham, who lived in the Westminster constituency, took no active part in all this. Yet, in a sense, Bentham did everything, like a Fabian Socialist of the twentieth century working behind the scenes. In his *Plan of Parliamentary Reform, in the Form of a Catechism*, first published in 1818, he supplied

the "philosophical and unanswerable" vindication of manhood suffrage and the secret ballot. This document, along with the essay *On Government*, composed by his greatest disciple, James Mill, was to prove the most influential statement of the politics of Philosophical Radicalism, perhaps the most effective propaganda for the achievement of the rather disappointing "break-through" of 1832. But the principal effect of "Philosophic Radicalism" was the conversion of the younger generation of the middle-class. Knowledge of the speculative principles of men in general between the age of twenty and thirty, Bacon said, is the one great source of political prophecy. The influence of the Philosophic Radicalism of Bentham and James Mill upon the junior intelligence of England in the 1820's, especially at Cambridge, was regarded by John Stuart Mill as "an historical event". The tendency towards "Liberalism in general . . . which showed itself in a portion of the more active-minded young men of the higher classes from this time to 1830," Mill wrote in his *Autobiography*, and especially through the Cambridge Union Debating Society, helped to precipitate opinion in the dozen years which preceded the passing of the first Reform Bill in 1832. No less important for the growth of Radicalism was Bentham's *Radicalism not Dangerous*, which he wrote in 1820. This helped, as Halévy wrote, some fifty years ago, "to separate the cause of Radicalism from the cause of what would to-day be called Communism". It brought about the assimilation of Radicalism to traditional English Liberalism. "The party tended to lose its Utopian and revolutionary character, and to become a party of bourgeois doctrinaires . . ." The Philosophical Radicals made Radicalism respectable.

This was far from being the whole story of Radicalism in these years. Like a classical education, Philosophic Radicalism was the prerogative of a few. "To the immense majority of men, even in civilized countries," Coleridge said, "speculative philosophy has ever been and must ever remain, a *terra incognita*," and the minds that really govern the machine of society are at all times few. "New ideas," whether in learned literature or in politics, a contemporary scholar, writing of the incidence of Latin and Greek, has reminded us, "like new fashions, percolate downwards from above." The liveliest, and certainly the noisiest, propagators of radical reform in the years after Waterloo were not advocates of new ideas. Least of all were they philosophers or speculative thinkers, despite Cartwright's

nonsense about Anglo-Saxon democracy, and Cobbett's Chesteronian nonsense about Merrie England. They knew very well that working-men would not respond with enthusiasm to irrefragable proofs that manhood suffrage was the logical outcome of a sensationalist psychology, or the end-product of a calculation in political arithmetic. The most they could be relied on to swallow was the emotive doctrine of the Rights of Man (Nonsense-on-Stilts, as Bentham called it). And anyway, reformism always goes down best when well seasoned with personalities and a dramatic vocabulary of denunciation. "The bold assertion that the present hardships of all classes are owing to the number and amount of pensions and sinecures," Coleridge wrote, in 1817, was most useful to the demagogue because "the hypothesis allows of a continual reference to persons, and to all the uneasy and malignant passions which personalities are of all means the best fitted to awaken". Hence the prodigious success of Cobbett's *Political Register*, which simply lived on vituperative castigation of fundlords, pensioners, sinecurists, borough-mongers, and the rest of the pestilent crew who infested "the industrious, laborious, kind and virtuous people" of the old England from which he came, and for whose cause he was determined to fight to the last breath of his body, though all the impediments raised up by hell should be against him. This, rather than Bentham's Felicific Calculus, was what the rank and file of Radical politicians wanted to hear about. Cobbett hated "Feelosoferers" ("My God, how I hate them!"), and while he could approve of Sir Francis Burdett, a countryman like himself, and with great snob-value for recruiting the energies of "the really efficient part of the people", he described Bentham's works as "tedious and puzzling beyond all mortal endurance," and was inclined to think that Bentham only "kept up his nonsense" in order "to hurt Mr. Hunt and me". He need not have worried. Cobbett's journalism, Hunt's mob oratory, Cartwright's "Hampden Clubs" were the really effective forces which promoted the education of the masses of the people for the build-up of the extra-parliamentary pressure behind the Whig campaign for the winning of the Great Reform Bill of 1832.

The victory of 1832 was an equivocal victory for English Radicalism. The Radicals put their shoulders to the wheel, but the wheel got stuck. The aristocracy had been brought to share power with the middle-classes, and it soon became obvious that

their main concern was now to establish the myth that 1832 was "a final settlement"—the myth that earned for Lord John Russell the nickname of "Finality Jack". By 1834, Earl Grey himself was declaiming against Parliament's being urged "by a constant and active pressure from without to the adoption of any measures the necessity of which has not been fully proved, and which are not strictly regulated by a careful attention to the settled institutions of the country in both Church and State", and in the same year Sir Robert Peel issued his Tamworth Manifesto accepting the Reform Bill as "a final and irrevocable settlement . . . which no friend to the peace and welfare of this country will attempt to disturb". He added at once that if acceptance of the Reform Bill meant that "we are to live in a perpetual vortex of agitation . . . promising instant redress of anything which anybody may call an abuse", he would not undertake to adopt it and enforce it as a rule of government. In statements such as these, fair notice was given that Whigs and Tories alike thought it high time to dig in their toes.

Much reformist legislation was passed in the five years which intervened between the passing of the Bill and the accession of Queen Victoria. Slavery was abolished—in the colonies; the first effective Factory Act was passed—for children; the first Treasury grant was made for primary education—£20,000—to voluntary societies which ran denominational schools; a Poor Law Amendment Act was framed—mainly to cut off "outdoor relief"; and in 1835 a Municipal Reform Act placed town government on a ratepayer suffrage. Radicals regarded all this as "a feast of the Barmecide", a banquet at which poor men sat down and were not fed. They had regarded the Reform Bill as "only a beginning, a means to a number of ends which they were confident of attaining, and for the most part of attaining quickly". As a minimum they wanted the Secret Ballot, constituency reform, Church reform (especially abolition of Church rates), abolition of "Taxes on Knowledge" (their name for the heavy newspaper Stamp Duties and the high Paper Duty). The Reform Bill itself was open to the objection that it disfranchized numbers of poor voters, and "Orator" Hunt, who had roared himself hoarse for years in the Radical cause, found himself deprived of considerable numbers of his electorate at Preston. Better half a loaf than no bread, many Radicals had said on the eve of 1832, but the other half was not to be even dimly in sight for another thirty-

five years. Chartism was at least in part a natural response to this frustration, disappointment and disillusionment, though it was a good deal more and a good deal else, too. Chartism was not a purely Radical movement, nor even a purely working-class movement. It contained in its Six Points traditional Radical demands which go back to Cartwright and Wilkes, the Society of the Supporters of the Bill of Rights, and the London Corresponding Society of nearly half a century earlier. But it contained also the intense moral and even religious feeling of a people in revolt against the tyranny of "things"—things which, as Marx was to put it, were now in the saddle and rode mankind.

"There is now nothing definite in politics except Radicalism," wrote John Stuart Mill to Thomas Carlyle in May, 1832, "and we shall have nothing but Radicals and Whigs for a long time to come." Nothing could have been further from the truth. The first reformed House of Commons, as Halévy wrote, contained like its predecessors an overwhelming majority of country gentlemen and members of the aristocracy. If it differed little from its predecessors in social composition, however, it certainly reflected a wider range of views. For one thing, it contained Philosophic Radicals like Grote and Roebuck, Molesworth and Buller, and some Tory estimates despondently put the possible Radical strength as high as 190. This figure, however, was only to be approached by dropping the capital "R" to lower-case and identifying the word with "anti-Government", and by including all Dissenters, humanitarians, manufacturers, and Daniel O'Connell's Irishmen. It soon became evident that Government needed to have no fear of any "combined demonstration from the discordant groups of more advanced Reformers". Even the most aggressive Radicals quickly realized that they had no chance whatever of running away with the new House of Commons. Cobbett's amendment to the Address from the Throne raised him only 23 votes, while he had reckoned on nearer a hundred. Mr. Creevey noted: "It is made perfectly manifest by their first vote that the reformed Parliament is not a Radical one." All the imagined radical legions, "with Cobbett to boot, could only muster 40 against 400". John Stuart Mill was changing his tune, too. "Some of our Utilitarian Radicals are downcast enough," he wrote to Carlyle in March, 1833, "having deemed that the nation had in it more of wisdom and virtue than they now see it

has, and that the vicious state of the representation kept this wisdom and virtue out of Parliament." He thought that one good thing might come out of their disappointment: "that they will no longer rely on the infallibility of Constitution-mongering . . ." They were digging a little nearer to the root of the evil now, "though they have not got to the tap-root". He advised Carlyle to read Roebuck's article on National Education in the last number of Tait's Magazine.

J. A. Roebuck, a friend of John Stuart Mill and devoted to the anti-privilege campaign of the Benthamites, was a typical Radical in that he was never typical of anything but John Arthur Roebuck. He had "strong mineral connections" (being a descendant of the founder of the Carron Iron Works, and Member for Sheffield), a very small frame and a very big head, a loud voice and an aggressive manner (he came from Canada), and his famous speech proposing a national, free, compulsory system of primary education, in 1833, was the prelude to the first state grant for the education of the children of the poor. Thomas Attwood, the Radical banker of Birmingham, was another fizzing eccentric, this time in the cause of plentiful paper-money, inflation, and repeal of Robert Peel's Act for the Resumption of Cash Payments, of 1819. He believed (probably correctly) that a "run on the banks" would defeat the Duke, and the Tories, in the Reform Bill crisis of 1832 (TO STOP THE DUKE—GO FOR GOLD!). His Birmingham Political Union was one of the original homes of Chartism, and he must ever remain a hero of the history of Birmingham Radicalism. Others, like Edwin Chadwick and Nassau Senior, devoted their eccentricities to the cause of reform, especially of the Poor Law and Public Health, from behind the scenes, like the Fabian Socialists of a later generation. Bentham's life-long devotion to the cause of law reform, and the reform of the penal code, reached at any rate a partial fruition in the labours of Robert Peel. Similarly, Bentham's inspiration of "Emancipate your Colonies" (1793) was to find issue in the work of men (not all of them Radicals) like Lord Durham ("Radical Jack"), Richard Cobden, and Gibbon Wakefield. Radicalism was, however, inhibited in playing an effective part in the capture of state power for legislative interference on behalf of the poor by the *damnosa hereditas* of Benthamite political economy, or *laissez-faire*. That is why Radicalism finds a more legitimate place in the heredity of Liberalism than in the ancestry of Socialism.

Perhaps one is only saying in all this that Radicalism was always more a matter of temperament than of intellectual adherence to a unified creed. Thereby it certainly proved its essential Englishry during the century between the accession of George III and the passing of the second Reform Bill. In all these years, it never produced either a leader or a hierarchy of leadership, either a man or a group of men of evidently ministerial timber, and capable of working together as a party in power. Brougham was too unreliable. Durham was too ill-tempered. Radicals were cursed (some would say blessed) with their temperamental idiosyncrasies, their genius for political fragmentation. It might be said of them, as it has been said of the Christians, that wherever two or three are gathered together, two will not be on speaking terms with the third. If they had been less individualistic, it is likely that they would not have been Radicals at all in the days when Nature really did seem to contrive that every little boy and girl in England should be born either a little Liberal or a little Conservative.

The Radicals served best not as a Third Party but as "a third force", bringing to bear upon Whigs and Tories alike that "pressure from without" which could nudge them powerfully in appropriate directions at the behest of insistent forces stirring in the body politic. It is from the study of this "pressure from without" that Dr. Maccoby thinks we can gain a true appreciation of the place of Radicalism among the constructive historical forces of the period, and a more comprehensive insight into the deeper motive forces of nineteenth-century politics below the parliamentary level.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The chronicler of English Radicalism is Dr. Simon Maccoby, whose exhaustive work, *ENGLISH RADICALISM*, began to appear in 1935. The later volumes, which cover the years of origin, 1762-1785, and 1786-1832, came out in 1935 and 1955 respectively. His contribution to the *British Political Tradition* series (Ed. Alan Bullock and F. W. Deakin), *The Radical Tradition*, appeared in 1952, and offers a most useful conspectus of the subject.

The classic authority for Philosophic Radicalism remains Elie Halévy's *La Formation du Radicalisme Philosophique* (English translation, by Mary Morris, *The Growth of Philosophic Radicalism*, 1928). Two helpful works on the early history of Radicalism are

I. R. Christie, *Wilkes, Wyvill and Reform* (1962), and George Rudé, *Wilkes and Liberty* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1962).

The best general history of these years is still Halévy's *History of the English People in the 19th century* (Tr. E. I. Watkin, 1927, revised 1953). Volumes II and III (*The Liberal Awakening, 1815-30*, and *The Triumph of Reform, 1830-41*) are most relevant for the present subject.

Other works that supply the general history are volumes XII and XIII of *The Oxford History of England*: Steven Watson's *Reign of George III* and Sir Llewellyn Woodward's *Age of Reform*.

H. W. C. Davis' *Age of Grey and Peel* (1929) and P. A. Brown's *The French Revolution in English History* (1918) are especially interesting for the development of Radical organizations, while G. S. Veitch's *The Genesis of Parliamentary Reform* (1913, and recently reprinted) sets the Radical groups in the story of reformist movement in general. Of the great trilogy on the English Labourer in the period 1760-1832 by J. L. and Barbara Hammond, the volume on *The Skilled Labourer* (1919) is most relevant to Radical activity. R. J. White's *Waterloo and Peterloo* offers a somewhat different picture.

The peculiar affinity between Radical politics and Protestant Dissent intensely interested Halévy, and reference should be made especially to Vol. I, Part III, ch. I, and Volume II, Introduction. Professor Butterfield threw a brilliant light on this topic in his *George III, Lord North, and the People* (1949), pp. 182-4, and the whole question is usefully discussed in A. H. Lincoln's *Some Political and Social Ideas of English Dissent, 1763-1800* (1935).

Contemporary documents are to be found in Harriet Martineau's *History of England during the Thirty Years' Peace, 1816-46* (2 vol., 1849). Miss Martineau was born in 1809, and was herself of the Philosophical Radical temper. To her, the history of these years was contemporary history. Her *Autobiography* (3 vol., 1877) is also of interest. Nearer to the realities of everyday Radical politics is Samuel Bamford's *Passages in the Life of a Radical* (2 vol., 1839 and 1842). The best edition of this priceless work is that of H. Dunkley, 1893. Cobbett, too, was very much "of the soil", and William Reitzel has constructed an autobiography from his writings under the title *Progress of a Ploughboy to a Seat in Parliament* (The Faber Library, No. 26: 1933). *The Life and Struggles of William Lovett in His Pursuit of Bread, Knowledge and Freedom* (1876) is of course a classic of working-class history, but of more interest for the story of Chartism than of Radicalism in our period. The late R. H. Tawney produced a useful reprint in Bohn's Popular Library in 1920. Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881), who liked to call himself the deepest and (oddly) quietest Radical of his time, has left us the most acute and imaginative treatment of Radicalism in his *Chartism* (1839) and his *Past and Present* (1843).

Philosophic Radicalism. John Stuart Mill's *Autobiography* (1873), of which there is a handy edition by Harold Laski in the Oxford World's Classics (1924), is an important document for the evolution of Benthamite Radicalism. His father's essay, *On Government* (1818-19), which was reprinted by Ernest Barker at the Cambridge University Press in 1937, is the most impressive statement of the political theory of Philosophical Radicalism, though the original statements are to be found in Sir John Bowring's edition of the *Works* of Jeremy Bentham (11 vol., 1838-40, Edinburgh). For Bentham's *Plan of Parliamentary Reform, in the form of a Catechism*, see Bowring's vol. X, pp. 495-7; and for his *Radicalism not Dangerous* see Bowring, Vol. III.

Other contributors to Radical doctrine are: Tom Paine, *Rights of Man* (1791-2), available as No. 718 of Everyman's Library; Major John Cartwright's pamphlets, *Take Your Choice* (1776) and *Mock Reform, Half Reform, and Constitutional Reform* (1810), which are difficult to come by, though some notion of their contents may be gained from Maccoby's *Radical Tradition*, and from Cartwright's *Life and Correspondence*, by F. D. Cartwright (2 vol., 1826).

Radicalism is best studied in the lives of the Radicals themselves, in all their diversity. Some of the most important sources are: Graham Wallas' *Life of Francis Place* (1908), M. W. Patterson's *Life and Times of Sir Francis Burdett* (2 vol., 1931), G. D. H. Cole's *Life of William Cobbett* (1924), M. D. Conway's *Life of Tom Paine* (2 vol., 1892), Alexander Bain's *Life of James Mill* (1862), and Anne Houl't's *Life of Joseph Priestley*. There are lives of some of the parliamentary Radicals in Mrs. Grote's *Personal Life of George Grote* (1873), Mrs. M. G. Fawcett's *Life of Sir William Molesworth* (1901), R. E. Leader's *Life of J. A. Roebuck* (1897), and L. Horner's *Memoirs and Correspondence of Francis Horner, M.P.* (2 vol., 1943).

Two nineteenth-century novels which bring the Radicals vividly to life are George Eliot's *Felix Holt the Radical*, and Mark Rutherford's *The Revolution in Tanner's Lane*.

Dr. Maccoby's volumes contain exhaustive bibliographies throughout. All the works in the above bibliography were published in London unless otherwise stated.

AIDS FOR TEACHERS

Other Leaflets in the Series. Price 2s. each (to members, 1s. 3d.)

- No. 1. The Hungry Forties, by W. H. Chaloner. (1957.)
- No. 2. Religion and Politics 1559-1642, by W. A. Barker. (1957.)
- No. 3. The Effect of the Loss of the American Colonies on English Policy, by W. R. Brock. (1957.)
- No. 4. The Investiture Disputes, by C. N. L. Brooke, M.A. (1958.)
- No. 6. The Domestic System in Industry, by D. C. Coleman. (1960.)
- No. 7. Enclosures in the 18th Century, by R. A. C. Parker. (1960.)
- No. 8. The Causes of the American Civil War, by A. A. Conway. (1961.)
- No. 9. The Eleven Years' Tyranny of Charles I, by H. F. Kearney. (1962.)
- No. 10. The Pattern of English Politics in the 18th Century, by J. B. Owen. (1962.)

Other important recent publications include:

TEACHING OF HISTORY LEAFLETS

- No. 19. The Teaching of History to Non-Specialists in Sixth Forms, by C. P. Hill. (1962.) 2s. 6d. (to members, 1s. 6d.).
- No. 20. Notes on the Teaching of Far Eastern History, by W. G. Beasley. (1962.) 3s. 6d. (to members, 2s. 6d.).
- No. 21. The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools, by F. J. Dwyer. (1964.) 3s. 6d. (to members 2s. 6d.).

and

- H.65. Guide to Illustrative Material for Use in Teaching History, by Gwyneth Williams. 8s. 6d. (to members, 5s. 6d.).
- H.67. Medieval European History. A Select Bibliography, by R. H. C. Davis. (1963.) 5s.

also, now available:—

ENGLISH HISTORY IN PICTURES—The Early Middle Ages, edited by R. H. C. Davis, and Tudor Times, edited by J. Hurstfield. Each volume with an introduction and sixteen pages of plates (including eight in full colour): detailed description of each plate. Published by Routledge and Kegan Paul. 12s. 6d. 8s. 6d. (9s. post free) to members ordering through the Association. The volumes on The Later Middle Ages, edited by Margaret Sharp, and Stuart Times, edited by E. S. de Beer, are 8s. 6d. each from the Association.

THE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

This leaflet is the eleventh in a series sponsored by the Historical Association, which is also responsible for many other publications of value to teachers and students of history. Current list available on application.

To join the Historical Association, or to obtain further details of its work, aims and services to teachers, write to:

The Hon Secretary,
The Historical Association,
59a, Kennington Park Road,
London, S.E.11
Reliance 3901.
